

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/706,212	11/12/2003	Michael E. Connell	5083.1US (01-0428.01/US) 6326		
24247	7590 05/25/2006		EXAMINER		
TRASK BRITT			WILSON, ALLAN R		
P.O. BOX 2550 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84110			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2815		
			DATE MAILED: 05/25/2006	DATE MAILED: 05/25/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	•		
		10/706,212	CONNELL ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Allan R. Wilson	2815			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence address			
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. (D) (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status	,					
_	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 M</u>	av 2006				
		action is non-final.				
,	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
٠,٣	closed in accordance with the practice under E					
Dispositi	ion of Claims					
_	Claim(s) <u>1,2,4-8,10-14,16-20 and 22-24</u> is/are	pending in the application				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw					
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠	Claim(s) 1,2,4-8,10-14,16-20 and 22-24 is/are	rejected.				
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Applicati	on Papers					
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d)			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)l	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicativity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage			
2) Notice 3) Information Paper	t(s) te of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date 0506.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/706,212

Art Unit: 2815

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 USC § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,827,771 to Ginn et al. ("Ginn") of record in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,798,558 to Tyson et al. ("Tyson").

With regards to claims 1, 7, 13 and 19, Ginn illustrates in figures 2-4B (entire document), particularly figure 2, a ROICS (such as a transimpedance amplifier, col. 1, lines 11-12) a semiconductor substrate 12 having a front side 12c and a back side 12b and having a low ratio of height to horizontal dimension (see FIG. 2);

an integrated circuit 14 on a portion of the front side;

layers (col. 3, lines 6-10) covering a portion of the integrated circuit causing a stress on at least a portion of the substrate; and

a stress or force balancing layer 18 covering at least a portion of the backside substantially balancing the stress caused by the passivation layer covering a portion of the integrated circuit (see col. 3, lines 27-58), the stress or force balancing layer comprising at least a physical vapor deposition material (sputtering Si₃N₄ col. 3, lines 59-67). Additionally, "a

chemical vapor deposition material" and "a physical vapor deposition material" are product by process limitations (see MPEP 2113).

Ginn does not show specifically a passivation layer. Tyson discloses in the abstract and col. 7, lines 15 a transimpedance amplifier with a passivation layer (step 65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a passivation layer. The motivation for doing this is to protect the underlying layers.

Regarding claims 2, 8, 14 and 20, Ginn illustrates in FIG. 2 the stress-balancing layer comprises a single component layer 18.

Regarding claims 4, 10, 16 and 22, Applicants are reminded that intended functional use (laser-marking) is given no patentable weight in claims drawn to structure. See In re Pearson 181 USPQ 641 and Ex parte Minks 169 USPQ 120.

Claims 5, 6, 11, 12, 17, 18, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 USC § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ginn and Tyson as applied to claims 1, 7, 13 and 19 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,731,954 to Cheon.

With regards to claim 5, Ginn and Tyson are discussed above, they do not show an adhesive layer attached to the device. Cheon illustrates in figure 1 and discloses in col. 4, lines 15-19 an adhesive layer attached to the device 30. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have an adhesive layer attaching to the device 30 to a heat sink 26. The motivation for doing this is to remove heat from the device.

Regarding claims 6, 12, 18 and 24, Applicants are reminded that intended functional use (laser-marking) is given no patentable weight in claims drawn to structure. See In re Pearson 181 USPQ 641 and Ex parte Minks 169 USPQ 120.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The arguments that Sakaki et al. could not be used as prior art was persuasive.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Application/Control Number: 10/706,212 Page 5

Art Unit: 2815

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from an examiner should be directed to Primary Examiner Allan Wilson whose telephone number is (571) 272-1738. Examiner Wilson can normally be reached 8:00-6:30 Tuesday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ken Parker can be reached on (571) 272-2298. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

> Allan R. Wilson **Primary Examiner** 22 May 2006